each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 26, 2009, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, GOVERNMENT INFORMATION, FEDERAL SERVICES, AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

1. Subcommittee rules. The Subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Quorums.

A. Transaction of routine business. One-third of the membership of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided that one Member of the Minority is present. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term ''routine business'' includes the convening of a meeting and the consideration of any business of the Subcommittee other than reporting to the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs any measures, matters or recommendations.

B. Taking testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony.

C. Proxies prohibited in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

3. Subcommittee subpoenas. The Chairman of the Subcommittee, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials at a hearing, provided that the Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by him/her of disapproval of the subpoena within 72 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

Immediately upon authorization of the issuance of a subpoena under these rules, a written notice of intent to issue the subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs waive the 48-hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

When the Subcommittee or its Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman.

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISASTER RECOVERY RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 26, 2009, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the rules of procedure of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISASTER RECOVERY

1. Subcommittee rules. The Subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Quorums.

A. Transaction of routine business. One-third of the membership of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided that one Member of the Minority is present. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term ''routine business'' includes the convening of a meeting and the consideration of any business of the Subcommittee other than reporting to the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs any measures, matters or recommendations.

B. Taking testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony.

C. Proxies prohibited in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

3. Subcommittee subpoenas. The Chairman of the Subcommittee, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials at a hearing, provided that the Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by him/her of disapproval of the subpoena within 72 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

Immediately upon authorization of the issuance of a subpoena under these rules, a written notice of intent to issue the subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs waive the 48-hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

When the Subcommittee or its Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman.

DC VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I had intended to speak briefly yesterday on a very important piece of legislation, S. 160, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009, but I was delayed by meetings and so wanted to have an opportunity to address this bill today. S. 160 provides the people of our Nation's capital with permanent voting representation for the first time in over 200 years. Legislation on this matter has been bottled up for many years in the Senate, and I am hopeful that this year it will finally be enacted.

Despite our Nation's great progress over the years toward removing unnecessary and irrelevant voting restrictions—including those based on race, sex, wealth, property ownership, and marital status—about half a million U.S. citizens are effectively unrepresented in the U.S. Congress. Major decisions in domestic and foreign policy are made in these citizens' backyards, but they have no one to represent their concerns as a voting Member of Congress.

As a recent New York Times editorial stated, ''Washington's lack of representation is profoundly undemocratic. Its residents are American citizens who pay taxes, vote for the president and serve and die in the military. Although the city is relatively small, it is more populous than Wyoming and nearly equal to those of Vermont and Alaska.'' DC residents pay the second highest per capita Federal income taxes in the country but have no vote on how the Federal Government spends their money. The famous phrase, ''no taxation without representation,'' that ignited the American Revolution and launched the original Thirteen Colonies on their quest for independence is

still displayed prominently on DC license plates today.

It is ironic that the city most closely associated with our democratic Government is the very place that U.S. citizens remain without a voice or a vote in Congress. In the words of Thomas Paine: ''The right of voting for representatives is the primary right by which other rights are protected.'' It is, in fact, the right on which all others in our democracy depend. The Constitution guarantees it, and the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly underscored that it is one of our most precious and fundamental rights as citizens.

I know that some opponents argue that the reasons the Founders made the Nation's Capital a separate district, rather than locate it within a State, remain sound, and therefore we should not tinker with their work, even at the cost of continued disenfranchisement of DC's citizens. That argument ignores the commitment we all must have to extending the full franchise to all Americans and to ensuring their representation in Congress. And it ignores the fact that article I of the Constitution explicitly gives Congress legislative authority over the District ''in all cases whatsoever.'' The courts have over time described this power as ''extraordinary and plenary'' and ''full and unlimited,'' and decades of legislative and judicial precedents make clear that the simple word ''states'' in article I—which provides that the House of Representatives ''shall be composed of members chosen by the people of the several states''—does not trump Congress's legislative authority to grant representation in the House to citizens of the District. Even so, to address the concerns of some, section 2(a)(2) of the bill states that ''The District of Columbia shall not be considered a State for purposes of representation in the United States Senate.''

The current bipartisan compromise embodied in this bill would increase the number of seats in the House of Representatives from 435 to 437. It would provide one seat for a voting Member representing DC that is predominantly Democratic and one at-large seat for Utah in a district that is predominantly Republican-leaning and which was next in line for congressional representation in the House according to 2000 census data. This legislation strikes the appropriate balance by allowing additional representation for both DC and Utah without disadvantaging either national political party. It embodies a reasonable compromise and allows for a responsible reassessment during the next reapportionment effort.

Congress has never granted the DC Delegate full voting rights in the House. Whether such a Federal law is constitutional has never been placed squarely before the courts. While no one can respond to the constitutionality question with certainty until the U.S. Supreme Court issues a binding decision directly on point, a bipartisan group of academics, judges, and lawyers have concluded that Congress has the authority to provide for voting representation for the District's people. Upon review of the arguments on both sides, I agree. I believe that the Constitution vests in Congress broad power to regulate national elections and plenary authority over DC under article I, section 8, clause 17, known as the ''District clause,'' to address this problem legislatively without the need for a constitutional amendment.

When even conservative legal scholars—from Judges Ken Starr, former U.S. Solicitor General appointed by President George H.W. Bush, to former Assistant Attorney General Viet Dinh appointed by President George W. Bush—have done exhaustive legal analyses which outline the positive case for Congress granting representational rights to citizens of the District, you know there is a strong case to be made. In any event, it is clear to me that these important constitutional questions should ultimately be resolved by the U.S. Supreme Court, and enactment of this bill would enable us to do just that. If opponents of the bill are so certain of their constitutional arguments, they should, it seems to me, allow those arguments to be tested in the full light of day, in the courts, and be resolved once and for all. If it were to be enacted and then struck down because of constitutional infirmities, it would then be clear that a constitutional amendment is the only viable alternative left to DC citizens. This bill provides for expedited review by the courts of the constitutionality of the law, a prudent step in my view.

Mr. President, I would like to briefly address the issue of the fairness doctrine, which was the subject of two votes yesterday. This doctrine, enforced by the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, for over 30 years, required broadcast licensees to cover issues of public importance in a fair, balanced manner.

The fairness doctrine was established to ensure that there would be a diversity of views available to the public in the limited media market available at the time of its adoption. At the time of its establishment, there were just three major television networks and a far smaller number of radio stations. However, in 1987, the FCC rescinded the policy after concluding that the doctrine was no longer necessary given the abundance of media outlets available to the public.

I have been supportive of the fairness doctrine in the past because a well-informed citizenry is of fundamental importance to our democracy. However, given the incredible communications innovations just over the last decade and the explosion of new news sources, I believe that reinstating the fairness doctrine could prove unnecessary and unmanageably complex. Today, citizens can get their news from the major broadcast television networks, a growing number of 24-hour cable news networks, dozens of radio stations, and hundreds or thousands of Internet news outlets and blogs.

I supported the amendment offered yesterday by Senator DEMINT because, in my view, such a fundamental issue as how the public gets its news deserves a larger forum for debate than the FCC provides. The DeMint amendment ensures that only Congress would have the authority to reinstate the fairness doctrine. While the FCC will continue to play a critically important role in regulating telecommunications, as the elected representatives of the people, the Members of this body and the House of Representatives must be involved in whether to reinstate such a far-reaching policy.

Mr. President, what is at stake with the DC voting rights legislation is nothing less than a fundamental issue of fairness in voting. Every eligible citizen, regardless of where he or she lives, has a constitutionally guaranteed right to be represented in Congress by a voting Member. This bill is another step forward in our efforts to ensure that all Americans are represented equally before this Government. It is the right thing to do, and this century is the right time to do it. In fact, it is long past due. I commend my colleague from Connecticut, the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, for bringing this important measure before the Senate and for getting it adopted by the Senate yesterday, even with the unnecessary and unwise addition of the gun provisions, which I hope will be stripped from the final bill. I hope the House will act favorably on it next week and that we will soon have a conference report before us to vote on. The President has made clear he would sign it, and I hope it will be enacted soon. The people of the District have waited much too long for that happy day.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. Presdient, I rise to commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP. I strongly support the NAACP and I am proud to be a lifelong member. Today, I wish to recognize this organization and the tremendous work it has done fighting for political, educational, social and economic equality for all. America would be a less equal and less just nation without the work and lasting influence of the NAACP.

One hundred years ago on the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth, a distinguished group of Americans came together to fight racial hatred and racial discrimination through nonviolence. In the intervening years, the NAACP has become one of the most respected civil rights organizations in